

August 23, 1967

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD — HOUSE

H11053

McCone, who headed a commission which investigated the Watts riots in Los Angeles two years ago, said there was no evidence of those disturbances being triggered by outside agitators.

HITS JOB TRAINING

He said the solution to the Negro problem in America is "jobs in the short range and education in the long range."

He was critical of many job training programs, saying they are not well-coordinated and not aimed at areas where there are job opportunities.

He said he placed great importance on the efforts of business men and unions to help provide Negroes with jobs. McCone also emphasized that Negroes must help themselves and assume a full measure of responsibility for their own well-being.

"Unless he [the Negro worker] has in his heart that success depends on his own efforts, no amount of money will produce results," McCone said. "I have great sympathy for the Negroes being disadvantaged and mistreated thru the years. But this does not relieve him of responsibility."

AID COSTS RISE

McCone said the one thing that disturbs him the most, two years after the Watts riots, is the rise in welfare costs in the areas. "Welfare costs in Los Angeles county have gone up 32 per cent in two years," he said, "while the money being spent on aid to dependent children has risen 54 per cent."

He suggested that all children in Negro areas be enrolled in the Head Start program for pre-schoolers and that teacher-student ratios in ghetto areas be reduced.

"There is some question of whether the Negro children can be brought to the level of white students," said McCone. "It hasn't been proven yet, but it is encouraging."

DISAGREES WITH CONCEPT

McCone, who appeared in executive session before President Johnson's special commission to probe rioting prior to testifying before the judiciary committee, told Sen. Strom Thurmond [R. S.C.], a member of the committee, that he disagreed with the whole concept of civil disobedience.

"You can express yourself thru the proper channels," said McCone, "as long as you wish, and as loud as you wish, but you have no right to inconvenience the balance of society just because you don't like a law."

McCone indicated that leniency by law enforcement officials toward such actions might have been a factor in recent riots.

Appearing after McCone, before the riots commission, was Mayor Hugh Addonizio of Newark. The mayor later released a statement blasting the actions of anti-poverty workers in his city.

He charged that in by-passing city government and dealing with neighborhood groups, the office of economic opportunity "gave a club to the so-called powerless groups" to help beat the cities down when they already were flat on their back.

ABM
THE URGENT NEED FOR AN ANTI-BALLISTIC MISSILE SYSTEM

(Mr. ASHBROOK asked and was given permission to extend his remarks at this point in the RECORD, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, as I have noted before, one of the reasons given by the Defense Department for not going ahead with the deployment of an antiballistic missile system has been the hope that the Soviet Union will reach an agreement with us not to further pursue the construction of such systems in the Soviet Union. As is generally known, the Soviets have been

working on ABM systems in the Moscow and Leningrad areas.

Dr. James D. Atkinson, of Georgetown University, in the August 21 Washington Report of the American Security Council, has advanced another compelling argument in favor of taking the necessary steps immediately to construct ABM systems here in the United States. Dr. Atkinson cites a report of August 3, 1967, of the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy which states that:

On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-71.

Adding its voice to those of others in Congress and the Joint Chiefs of Staff, Dr. Atkinson points out that a Senate Appropriations Subcommittee, in reporting on the Defense Department appropriations bill for fiscal year 1968, states:

It is the view of the Committee that the deployment of the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the Committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly.

As the Washington Report shows, the Chinese operational ICBM capability is just a few years away from realization, and yet the United States dickers with the Soviet Union to prevent the proliferation of ABM systems. How the approaching Chinese missile threat is going to be explained away will be interesting indeed.

It is urgently necessary that the American public concern themselves with this vital issue. What reasoning and policies allowed the continuing delay in constructing ABM systems should be an issue of high priority in the 1968 presidential campaign.

To further consideration and discussion of the antiballistic missile issue, I insert the article, "Counter-Deterrence and the ABM," by Dr. James Atkinson, international politics editor, of the American Security Council's Washington Report in the RECORD at this point:

COUNTER-DETERRENCE AND THE ABM

That trenchant observer of the American scene, Will Rogers, once observed that in the field of disarmament Americans had a tendency to scrap battleships while their opponents tore up blueprints. Something of this American tendency of an almost extremist goodwill is in evidence today with reference to the question of anti-ballistic missile defense. We talk and talk in the hope that we can persuade the Soviet Union to dismantle its present anti-ballistic missile system and to refrain from going ahead with further missile defenses. The Soviets stall in the negotiations while continuing to build and deploy their ABMs.

SOVIET CAPABILITIES AND INTENTIONS

The recent study prepared by a special subcommittee of the National Strategy Committee of the American Security Council entitled *The Changing Strategic Military Balance: U.S.A. vs. U.S.S.R.* has stated that "the preponderance of evidence points to the conclusion that the Soviet Union is succeeding in its massive drive toward strategic military superiority . . . (and that) the year 1967 falls in a crossover period with the U.S.S.R. estimates ranging between 16,000 and 37,000

(deliverable) megatons, to equal or exceed the U.S. estimated range of between 8,000 and 29,000 (deliverable) megatons." This study, with its graphic documentation of the Soviet thrust for military-technological superiority, has received, and continues to receive, widespread attention from leading editors and authorities in both the daily and the periodical press. The New York Times, for example, in a front page story on July 12, 1967, stated that ". . . the Defense Department did not directly contradict the study's findings, but argued that deliverable megatonnage was not an accurate indicator of 'true military capability'."

It has been argued in some quarters in the West, however, that Soviet capabilities as illustrated by the Soviet deployment of an ABM system need not be a cause for alarm since Soviet intentions are peaceful and the Cold War is, in fact, over.

But are the Soviet leaders mellowing? Unfortunately, the most recent evidence would appear to indicate that storm flags are flying in the Kremlin. Some storm signals are:

(1) The official pronouncement of the Communist Party of the Soviet Union issued June 25, 1967, in a summary of 50 years of Bolshevism. It stated that, "The domination of imperialism on the world scene has ended" because of the growth of Soviet military power. The statement also singled out the United States as the "main enemy" of the national liberation warfare movement and charged the state of Israel with aggression.

(2) Appointing (for the first time since Beria's execution in 1953) the Soviet secret police chief a member of the ruling Politburo. This is Yuri Andropov, whose promotion was announced June 22, 1967. Since the KGB (the Soviet secret police) have vast responsibilities for waging unconventional warfare around the world, it would appear that giving Andropov such power indicates stepped-up Cold War operations.

(3) Writing in the official Soviet Armed Forces newspaper, RED STAR, on June 3, 1967, Bulgarian Minister of Defense, General of the Army Dobri Dzhurov said: "The Soviet Union has always been and will continue to be the main political and material base of the world revolutionary process." (Emphasis added.) The general also went on to say that "The Soviet Union constitutes the main support of fighting Vietnam."

(4) Soviet escalation of the Vietnam war is another example of the Soviet's true intentions. Soviet shipping going into North Vietnamese ports has shown a marked increase this year over 1966. As of June 1967 the rate was eighteen per month with an additional 2 to 5 Soviet satellite ships per month. Indicative of this escalation is the Moscow Radio broadcast of July 28 which stated that Soviet ships "leave Odessa practically every day with cargoes for Vietnam."

(5) The recent hard-line in the Soviet press which continually attacks Israel, "Zionism," and the United States. In reporting this trend from Moscow, the *Washington Post* of August 8, 1967 stated that the press campaign was one which "to some senior diplomats here recall the worst days of the Cold War."

These indicators of increasingly "stormy cold war weather" indicate that Soviet strategists understand quite well that revolutionary agitation and propaganda, "peace marchers" in London and New York, guerrillas in Africa and Latin America are techniques of conflict on a par with guided missiles and nuclear submarines. But does it follow that these same Soviet strategists are unaware of the possibilities for nuclear blackmail of the West in the event that they attain strategic military-technological superiority? Indeed, one may well ask whether the present U.S. limitations on air strikes against military targets in North Viet Nam result from the steady accretion of Soviet military-technological power?

CHINESE COMMUNIST NUCLEAR WEAPONS DEVELOPMENT

Even if it were possible to disregard the evidence of the Soviet deployment of an ABM system or systems and the counter-interference which this poses to the announced U.S. policy of deterrence, it would be still more difficult to close our minds to the ominous developments in China.

The Chinese Communists exploded their first H-bomb on June 17, 1967. It was apparently a sophisticated implosion type in the two-to-seven megaton range. The complicated electronic triggering and measuring devices that would appear to have been required, in this and other nuclear tests, would be of great assistance to the Chinese in building an intercontinental missile. Since the Chinese progress in nuclear weapons development has been faster and more effective than had been anticipated by Western sources, it may be that they will also develop a nuclear ICBM delivery capability sooner than the mid-1970's, which is the time phase previously estimated by Western sources. Moreover, the Chinese now possess the design capability for a multimegaton thermonuclear weapon which can be delivered by aircraft.

The possibilities of the Chinese Communists exercising nuclear blackmail against Southeast Asian countries, Japan, or, indeed, against the United States are underscored in a report released August 3, 1967, by the Joint Congressional Committee on Atomic Energy. The Committee said: "We believe that the Chinese will continue to place a high priority on thermonuclear weapons development. With continued testing we believe they will be able to develop a thermonuclear warhead in the ICBM weight class with a yield in the megaton range by about 1970. We believe that the Chinese can have an ICBM system ready for deployment in the early 1970's. On the basis of our present knowledge, we believe that the Chinese probably will achieve an operational ICBM capability before 1972. Conceivably, it could be ready as early as 1970-1971."

The Joint Committee then went on to sound a warning about the direct threat to U.S. national security posed by Chinese Communist nuclear weapons developments by pointing out that "Most significant for the United States is the fact that a low order of magnitude attack could possibly be launched by the Chinese Communists against the United States by the early 1970's. At present we do not have an effective antiballistic-missile system which could repel such a suicidal (for the Chinese) but nevertheless possible strike."

THE STABILIZING VALUE OF A U.S. ABM SYSTEM

In the final analysis, the value of a system of deterrence is that the enemy believes about it. If the Soviets believe that the U.S. deterrent offensive force can be neutralized by their ABM systems to a point at which the Soviet war-making capability will sustain only an acceptable level of damage (and, of course, their acceptable level may be much higher than ours), then they have achieved a counter-deterrence posture which may lead them to risk—at a given crisis in international relations—a nuclear war.

Equally, if at some future point the Chinese Communists should believe (in the absence of a U.S. ABM system) that there is somewhat more of a "suicidal" element for the United States than for them in a nuclear war, they might, in a given confrontation, launch a surprise nuclear attack on America.

The evidence of the post-World War II period suggests that it has been the stabilizing factor of U.S. military-technological power which has prevented a general war. Today, under the impact of both the Soviet and Chinese Communist military-technological thrust, that stability appears to be threatened. Would the production and deployment of a U.S. ABM system—perhaps

even on a crash basis as a clear demonstration of credibility—have a definite stabilizing value on world politics? That it might well do so is indicated by the thoughtful and carefully measured words of the Senate Appropriations Committee. In reporting on the Defense Department Appropriation Bill for fiscal 1968 (August 4, 1967), the Committee said: "It is the view of the Committee that the deployment of the NIKE-X antiballistic missile system should be initiated immediately, and the Committee urges the executive branch of the Government to take action accordingly."

Dr. JAMES D. ATKINSON,
editor.

ONE-WEEK-A-MONTH RECESS FOR THE HOUSE

(Mr. SCHADEBERG asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute and to revise and extend his remarks.)

Mr. SCHADEBERG. Mr. Speaker, on Monday, August 21, the House amended the Legislative Act of 1959 authorizing each Member of the House one paid round trip to his district for each month the House is in session. While I agree that this is a step in the right direction, it is regretted that the next logical step was not taken.

The Representatives of the people do need to return to their districts to keep in personal contact with their constituents. The people have a right to question their Representatives on the issues of the day; and while many Congressman keep contact with their districts through the mails, there is no substitute for face-to-face confrontation.

If round trips are to be paid for by the Government, then ample opportunity to meet with the people should be provided so that money yields the greatest return. I refer to the suggestions I made for the reorganization of the House, which provide a 1-week-a-month recess from legislative activity which would provide the Members of the House an opportunity to hold office hours in their districts and to discuss pending legislation with interested parties before this legislation was considered on the floor of the House. Under my plan, the remainder of the month would be reserved for House business including regular sessions of the House from 12 noon to 5:30 Mondays through Fridays—5 days a week. Every Member would be expected to be present at the sessions with his district being well aware that he would be penalized paywise if he were not present without official permission from the Speaker.

Such orderly procedure would make it possible for legislation to be scheduled for a month in advance so that on his week in the district, the Member could discuss appropriate legislation with those individuals and groups who would be expressly affected—either by the passage or the failure of the passage of legislation. This would truly give the people a voice in their government, a chance to express themselves, an opportunity for the Member to better represent his district by gathering a body of facts and opinions upon which to base his judgment. Big business and large organizations have the finances to lobby in Washington; but the individual citizen, the

small businessman, the farmer, the student, and the teacher not only lack the time, but the finances, to come to Washington to discuss legislation with their Congressman.

Years ago, when the House met for 6 months or less, ample opportunity was provided for Members to keep in touch with their constituents. Today, with the House in session 10 to 12 months a year and having recess only during those periods when many of their constituents are away over holiday vacations, some way must be found to make representative government truly representative. It would make great deal of sense to provide each Member with a round-trip ticket for travel to his district each month if the Member were in a position to spend enough time in the district to justify the expense. Of course, some work can be done on weekends, but Members of the House are not super human beings. They need some time to be with their families—to worship in the church. They need days for recreation to refresh their body, the mind, and the soul. While each month the House is in session is a partial solution to the problems faced by most Members, the money could be better spent if there was an opportunity for the Member to spend enough time in the district at work to justify the cost of the ticket.

For some, of course, my remarks do not apply since they live within an hour or two from the Capitol to make ample use of time in return for the cost of the trip. For those of us who live several hours from the Capitol, including travel time to and from the airport, the time during the weekend is indeed limited since most of the time we are not advised early enough of the fact that no sessions will be held on Friday. It is difficult to make commitments on Friday even though at the last minute, time would be available for work in the district. Since the House is not in session every Monday, and we have no way of knowing whether quorums will be called, and in many cases whether business will transpire which will require a vote—no commitments can be made for Monday. On the other hand, if a week were provided, a schedule could be firmed up ahead of time, and the people could get to talk with their Representative in person.

THE SCANDALOUS TAX PREFERENCES OF THE OIL INDUSTRY

(Mr. JOELSON asked and was given permission to address the House for 1 minute, to revise and extend his remarks, and to include extraneous matter.)

Mr. JOELSON. Mr. Speaker, I hereby insert in the RECORD a letter which I have today written to Internal Revenue Commissioner Sheldon Cohen. This letter discloses a tax advantage enjoyed by oil companies by administrative ruling of the Internal Revenue Service which deprives the National Treasury of an estimated billion dollars a year.

Coming on top of the oil depletion allowance which the oil companies are so generously given, this administrative ruling serves to reemphasize the fact that the average taxpayer is not treated with